UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,844	01/31/2001	Curtis T. Gross	10005528-1	6269

7590   02/07/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
KHOSHNOODI, NADIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/774,844	GROSS, CURTIS T.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nadia Khoshnoodi	2137	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 November 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>1/31/2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Upon further consideration during the Appeal Conference held in light of the Appeal

Brief filed on 11/18/2005, the Examiner realizes that the Hong et al. reference contains every

limitation that Applicants are claiming in various claims. Therefore, claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, and 13-

14 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being fully anticipated by Hong et al. As such the

finality of the action (mailed 6/20/2005) is withdrawn and a 2nd Non-final Office Action is issued

and appears below.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 29-42

have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore the rejection with regards to

claims 29-42 is maintained.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references,

the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching,

suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir.

1992). In this case, Tetsuro does not teach away from McManis. Tetsuro teaches "users **can**

execute a file attached to a received e-mail message." Furthermore, in the following sentence,

Tetsuro teaches "the received e-mail message may be the one containing a code to automatically

execute a desired function, and it is not necessarily required for the users to manually execute an

arbitrary action for starting a proper processing" (See Abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

I.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

II.   Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being fully

anticipated by Hong et al United States Patent No. 5,710,883.

As per claim 1:

Hong et al. teach a method for sharing resources between first and second workstations

separated by a segment of a public network (col. 3, lines 35-43), comprising the steps of

transmitting an email message from said first workstation, to said second workstation (col. 3,

lines 35-43 and 54-63) separated from said first workstation by at least one security measure

disposed within a destination computing site (col. 3, lines 14-17), and employing a protocol to

enable said transmitted email message to penetrate said at least one security measure (col. 5, line

59 - col. 6, line 2); determining, by said second workstation, if an executable command is within

the script of the email message (col. 3, line 64 - col. 4, line 2); and executing the command if

within said script of the email message (col. 4, lines 2-8 and col. 5, lines 38-49).

As per claim 2:

Hong et al. further teach the method of claim 1 wherein the Simple Mail Transfer

Protocol is used as the specific protocol (col. 5, line 66 - col. 6, line 2).

As per claim 4:

Hong et al. further teach the method of claim 1 where executing step comprises the step

of performing an operation on data other than said transmitted message (col. 5, lines 38-43).

As per claim 6:

Hong et al. further teach the method of claim 1 where said at least one security measure is

a firewall (col. 5, lines 59-62).

As per claim 7:

Hong et al. further teach the method of claim 6 further comprising disposing said

destination computing site within a controlled-access network (col. 5, lines 59-62). Although the

term "controlled-access network" is not explicitly stated Hong et al. teach the use of a security

firewall which separates the destination computing site from the Internet, thus is identical to a

"controlled-access network."

As per claim 8:

Hong et al. further teach the method of claim 7 further comprising disposing said firewall

in between said public network and said controlled-access network (col. 5, lines 59-62).

As per claim 9:

Hong et al. further teach the method of claim 7 further comprising attaching an

executable file to said message (col. 5, lines 1-14) wherein said executing step comprises the step

of executing said attached executable file (col. 5, lines 31-49).

As per claim 13:

Hong et al. further teach a method of claim 1 wherein said executing step comprises performing an operation on a document attached to said message (col. 5, lines 35-49).

As per claim 14:

Hong et al. further teach a method of claim 1 wherein said executing step comprises performing an operation on a document resident within said destination computing site (col. 5, lines 45-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

III.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

IV.   Claims 5 and 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al United States Patent No. 5,710,883 and further in view of McManis United States Patent No. 5,680,461.

As per claim 5:

Hong et al. substantially teach the method as applied to claim 1 above. Not explicitly disclosed is the method further comprising the step of at said second workstation, verifying an identity of said first workstation. However, McManis teaches that a second workstation can verify the identity of the first workstation in order to ensure that the source of the email is valid. Therefore, it would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Hong et al. for the WWW

server's security firewall to verify the source/identity of the first workstation. The modification

of the firewall verifying the identity of the first workstation at the second workstation, i.e. the

WWW server, would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was

made, would have been motivated to do so since McManis suggests that verifying the source of a

packet is an important for security purposes in col. 4, line 57 – col. 5, line 3.

As per claim 15:

Hong et al. substantially teach the means for transmitting an email from a first

workstation of a plurality of workstations onto said public network (col. 3, lines 35-43); means

for enabling the transmitted email message to pass through a firewall separating said public

network from a second workstation (col. 3, lines 14-17 and col. 5, line 59 - col. 6, line 2); means

for receiving said transmitted email message at said second workstation (col. 3, lines 35-43 and

54-63); means for executing, at said second workstation, a selected function included in the

script in the email message (col. 3, line 64 - col. 4, line 2); and means for automatically

performing said selected function at said second workstation (col. 4, lines 2-8 and col. 5, lines

38-49).

Not explicitly disclosed is the system further comprising the step of at said second

workstation, verifying an identity of said first workstation and performing the function when

authenticated. However, McManis teaches that a second workstation can verify the identity of

the first workstation in order to ensure that the source of the email is valid. Therefore, it would

have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the method disclosed in Hong et al. for the WWW server's security firewall to

verify the source/identity of the first workstation. The modification of the firewall verifying the

identity of the first workstation at the second workstation, i.e. the WWW server, would have

been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been

motivated to do so since McManis suggests that verifying the source of a packet is an important

for security purposes in col. 4, line 57 – col. 5, line 3.

As per claim 16:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore,

Hong et al. teach a method wherein said executing step comprises performing an operation on a

document resident within said destination computing site (col. 5, lines 45-47).

As per claim 17:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Hong et al.

further teach the system wherein the Simple Mail Transfer Protocol is used as the specific

protocol for enabling communication of said message through said firewall (col. 5, line 66 - col.

6, line 2).

As per claim 18:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Hong et al.

further teach the system further comprising a mail server dedicated to said second workstation

and a means for enabling communication between said dedicated mail server and said second

workstation (col. 5, lines 15-25).

As per claim 19:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore,

McManis teaches the system wherein said means for verifying said authorization comprises

means for generating a digital signature (see claim 2) at said first workstation (fig. 6, element

608) and means for decrypting said digital signature at a firewall connected to a server dedicated

to a second workstation (fig. 3, element 324 and col. 6, lines 24-46). McManis also teaches that

the second workstation can have an internal firewall (col. 8, lines 1-17).

As per claim 20:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Hong et al.

further teach the system wherein said means for automatically performing comprises means for

running an executable file attached to said message (col. 5, lines 31-49).

As per claim 21:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore,

Hong et al. teach the system where means for automatically performing comprises means for

running an executable file identified in said message and resident in said controlled-access

network (col. 5, lines 45-47).

As per claim 22:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore,

Hong et al. teach the system wherein said executing step comprises performing an operation on a

document attached to said message (col. 5, lines 35-49).

As per claim 23:

Hong et al. substantially teach a system for causing a function to be performed at a

destination computing site remote from a requesting computing site (col. 3, lines 14-31)

comprising email composer disposed in communication with a requesting computing site for

composing a message including a task description (col. 5, lines 1-14); a network link for

enabling transmission of said composed email message (col. 5, lines 15-25); a mail gateway

disposed in communication with said destination computing site for receiving said transmitted

composed email (col. 5, lines 31-34); a mail server dedicated to a destination computing device

disposed within said destination computing site for identifying said task description (col. 5, lines

30-49); and means for executing said described task (col. 5, lines 43-49).

Not explicitly disclosed is the system further comprising the step of at said second

workstation, verifying an identity of said first workstation and performing the function when

authenticated. However, McManis teaches that a second workstation can verify the identity of

the first workstation in order to ensure that the source of the email is valid. Therefore, it would

have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the method disclosed in Hong et al. for the WWW server's security firewall to

verify the source/identity of the first workstation. The modification of the firewall verifying the

identity of the first workstation at the second workstation, i.e. the WWW server, would have

been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been

motivated to do so since McManis suggests that verifying the source of a packet is an important

for security purposes in col. 4, line 57 – col. 5, line 3.

As per claim 24:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 23 above. Furthermore,

McManis teaches the system wherein said authenticating data includes a digital signature (claim

2).

As per claim 25:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 23 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches the system wherein said destination computing site is coupled to a local area network as depicted by the protected side (109) of fig. 1.

As per claim 26:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 23. Furthermore, Hong et al. teach the task description is a script having instructions to the means for executing. The task description includes executable commands therefore includes instructions for executing (col. 3, lines 14-53).

As per claim 27:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 23. Furthermore, Hong et al. teach the task description is in the text of the email message. The task description includes executable commands and is sent in the email message (col. 3, lines 14-53).

V.   Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al United States Patent No. 5,710,883 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tetsuro, J.P. Pub No. 2000-162926.

As per claim 3:

Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1 above. Not explicitly disclosed is the method wherein said step of executing said command causes the second workstation to perform one of printing a document attached to the email message, generating a calendar entry on the second workstation, and running a diagnostic program on said second workstation. However, Tetsuro teaches printing a document attached to the email message as the executing step. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the method disclosed in Hong et al. to print a document attached to the email

message as the executing step. This modification would have been obvious because a person in

the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is

suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 154.

As per claim 12:

Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1. Not explicitly disclosed is the

method wherein said executing step causes said second workstation to print a document attached

to the email message. However, Tetsuro teaches printing a document attached to the email

message as the executing step. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Hong et al. to print a

document attached to the email message as the executing step. This modification would have

been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been

motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 154.

VI.   Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al

United States Patent No. 5,710,883 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tanno

United States Patent No. 5,960,177.

As per claim 10:

Hong et al. substantially teaches the method as applied to claim 1 above. Not explicitly

disclosed is a method wherein said executing step comprises the step of executing a routine

resident in said controlled-access network identified in said message. However, Tanno

substantially teaches the execution of a routine resident in said controlled-access network

identified in said message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Hong et al. to incorporate a

means to execute a routine resident in the controlled-access network as identified in the message.

The modification of the message containing a routine to be executed that is resident in the

controlled-access network would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the

invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tanno in col.

10, lines 1-21.

As per claim 11:

Hong et al. substantially teaches a method as applied to claim 10. Not explicitly

disclosed is a method wherein said executing step running a diagnostic program at said second

workstation. However, Tanno substantially teaches a method wherein said executing step

running a diagnostic program at said second workstation. Therefore, it would have been obvious

to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Hong

et al. to incorporate a step of running a diagnostic program at said second workstation. This

modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was

made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tanno in col. 10, lines 22-25.

VII.   Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al United

States Patent No. 5,710,883 and McManis United States Patent No. 5,680,461 as applied to claim

23 above, and further in view of Tetsuro, J.P. Pub No. 2000-162926.

As per claim 28:

Hong et al. and McManis substantially teach the system of claim 23. Not explicitly

disclosed is the task description having an instruction to print a document attached to the email

message. However, Tetsuro teaches printing a document attached to the email message as the

executing step. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Hong et al. and McManis to print a document attached to the email message as the executing step. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 154.

VIII. Claims 29-30, 32-35, 37-39, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis U.S. Patent No. 5,680,461 and further in view of Tetsuro J.P. Pub. No. 2000-162926.

As per claim 29:

McManis substantially teaches a method comprising transmitting an email from a first workstation, through a firewall, to a second workstation (fig. 1, elements 102, 105, and 103); and automatically executing, at the second workstation, the executable file attached to the email as seen in fig. 6, element 632. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is automatically detecting, by the second workstation, if an executable file is attached to the email. However, Tetsuro teaches determining whether or not the email contains an executable file attached to it. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis to incorporate a step of automatically detecting if an executable file is attached to the email at the second workstation. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraphs 10-11.

As per claim 30:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to print a document attached to the email (par. 154).

As per claim 32:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to print the email. However, Tetsuro teaches the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to print a document attached to the email. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches that the executable command can be contained in the body of the email. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro for the executable file to print the email automatically. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraphs 154 and 28.

As per claim 33:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to execute code already resident on the second workstation. However, Tetsuro teaches that mechanical operations can be performed such as measuring a system, where the information is resident on the second workstation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to execute code already resident on the second workstation.

This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention

was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 85.

As per claim 34:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Furthermore, Tetsuro

teaches the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second

workstation to print information on a printer, i.e. execute code at a device in communication with

the second workstation (par. 154).

As per claim 35:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Furthermore, Tetsuro

teaches the method automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to

execute code included as an attachment to the email (par. 10-11).

As per claim 37:

McManis substantially teaches the method comprising transmitting an email from a first

workstation to a second workstation (fig. 1, elements 102, 110, 103); and if the executable

instruction is present, then automatically executing, at said second workstation, the executable

instruction (fig. 6, element 632). Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is automatically

examining, at said second workstation, the email to determine if an executable instruction is (i)

within a body of the email or (ii) within an attachment to the email. However, Tetsuro teaches

that the email can be present in the body of the email or as an attachment to the email, thus it

must be determined where the executable instructions reside in the email in order to execute

them. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the method disclosed in McManis to examine the email to determine if the

executable instructions are within the body of the email or in an attachment to the email. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraphs 10-11 and 26-28.

As per claim 38:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches the method wherein the executable instruction is a script included within the body of the email (par. 41).

As per claim 39:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches wherein the executable instruction instructs the second workstation to print a document (par. 154). Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is printing a document to a specific printer. However, McManis teaches that one of the functions that can be performed is setting a default printer for printing purposes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to print the document to a specific printer. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by McManis, col. 7, lines 24-36.

As per claim 41:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Furthermore, McManis teaches the method wherein the executable instruction instructs the second workstation

to execute a routine located within a network to which the second workstation is connected (col.

7, lines 23-50).

As per claim 42:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Furthermore, Tetsuro

teaches the method wherein the executable instruction instructs the second workstation to print a

document attached to the email (par. 154).

IX.   Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis U.S.

Patent No. 5,680,461 and Tetsuro, J.P. Pub. No. 2000-162926 as applied to claim 29 above, and

further in view of Terao U.S. Patent No. 6,389,121.

As per claim 31:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Not explicitly

disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is the method wherein automatically executing the executable

file causes the second workstation to print a document located within a network that is accessible

to the second workstation. However, Terao teaches printing an image accessible to the second

workstation when the image must be stored due to the printer being inoperable at the time the

information was initially sent for printing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and

Tetsuro to automatically execute printing a document accessible to the second workstation. This

modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was

made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Terao in col. 9, line 56 – col.

10, line 19.

X.   Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis U.S.

Patent No. 5,680,461 and Tetsuro, J.P. Pub. No. 2000-162926 as applied to claim 29 above, and

further in view of Tanno U.S. Patent No. 5,960,177.

As per claim 36:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Furthermore,

McManis teaches the method wherein said executing step performs a routine in said controlled-

access network (protected side 109 of fig. 1) identified in said message in col. 2, lines 1-22. Not

explicitly disclosed by McManis is a method wherein automatically executing the executable file

causes the second workstation to execute a file resident within a network, the file being

accessible to the second workstation but not within the second workstation. However, Tanno

substantially teaches the execution of a routine resident in said controlled-access network

identified in said message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to

incorporate a means to execute a routine resident in the controlled-access network as identified in

the message. The modification of the message containing a routine to be executed that is

resident in the controlled-access network would have been obvious because a person in the art at

the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by

Tanno in col. 10, lines 1-21.

XI.   Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis U.S.

Patent No. 5,680,461 and Tetsuro, J.P. Pub. No. 2000-162926 as applied to claim 29 above, and

further in view of Terao U.S. Patent No. 6,389,121.

As per claim 40:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is the method wherein the executable instruction instructs the second workstation to print a document in a specific format. However, Terao teaches the print information being formatted before it is printed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to instruct the second workstation to print a document in a specific format. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Terao in col. 11, lines 17-31.

*References Cited, Not Used

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. US Patent No. 6,766,458
2. US Patent No. 6,725,268
3. US Patent No. 6,681,246

The above references have been cited because they are relevant due to the manner in which the invention has been claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nadia Khoshnoodi
Examiner
Art Unit 2137
2/03/2006

NK

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER